

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

AD-A197 122

JUL 22 1988

ELECTE

1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS

DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT  
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE:  
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)

ONR TECHNICAL REPORT #88-3

5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)

6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

6b. OFFICE SYMBOL  
(If applicable)

7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH (CODE 1142PT)

6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)

660 S. EUCLID, BOX 8111, DEPT. OF NEURO.,  
ST. LOUIS, MO 63110

7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)

PERSONNEL & TRAINING RESEARCH PROGRAMS  
800 NORTH QUINCY STREET  
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-50008a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING  
ORGANIZATION8b. OFFICE SYMBOL  
(If applicable)

9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

N00014-86-0289

9c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)

10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS

PROGRAM  
ELEMENT NO.  
61153NPROJECT  
NO.  
RR04206TASK  
NO.  
RR04206-OAWORK UNIT  
ACCESSION NO  
NR442a554

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)

Attentional Imbalances Following Head Injury

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Jennifer Sandson, Bruce Crosson, Michael I. Posner,  
Peggy P. Barco, Craig A. Velozo and Teresa C. Brobeck13a. TYPE OF REPORT  
TECHNICAL13b. TIME COVERED  
FROM 04MAY88 TO 01MAY8914. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day)  
May 30, 198815. PAGE COUNT  
25

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

17. COSATI CODES

FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP
05	10	

18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

We have employed three tasks, developed by cognitive psychologists to study attention, with a population of six brain injured subjects in a rehabilitation program. Each of the tasks had been validated by studies with unilateral stroke patients and appear to provide a means of examining the relative efficiency of the two cerebral hemispheres when demands upon them are placed in conflict. We found that five of the six patients had imbalances between the two hemispheres. Four of them met our definition of attentional because the imbalance interacted with cues. The results show that the three tests converge on a common picture of cerebral imbalances in these brain injury patients and may relate to some aspects of their normal functioning.

20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT

☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS

21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL

MICHAEL I. POSNER

22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)

(314) 362-3317

22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

ONR 1142PT

ATTENTIONAL IMBALANCES FOLLOWING HEAD INJURY

Jennifer Sandson, Bruce Crosson, Michael I. Posner,  
Peggy P. Barco, Craig A. Velozo and Teresa C. Brobeck

ONR Technical Report 88-3

Research sponsored by:

Personnel and Training Research Program  
Psychological Science Division,  
Office of Naval Research

Under Control Number:

N00014-86-K-0289

Contract Authority Number:

NR-442a554

Reproduction in whole or part is permitted for any  
purpose of the United States Government

ATTENTIONAL IMBALANCES FOLLOWING HEAD INJURY:

A Preliminary Analysis of Six Patients<sup>1</sup>

Jennifer Sandson<sup>\*,2</sup>, Bruce Crosson<sup>\*,#</sup>, Michael I. Posner<sup>\*</sup>  
Peggy P. Barco<sup>#</sup>, Craig A. Velozo<sup>#</sup> and Teresa C. Brobeck<sup>#</sup>

Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis

\* Departments of Neurology and Neurological Surgery  
# Head Injury Resource Center, Irene W. Johnson Institute of  
Rehabilitation

1 This research was supported by the Office of Naval Research Contract  
N-0014-86-0299.

Reprints can be obtained by writing to Neuropsychology Laboratory, Box  
8111, Washington University School of Medicine, 660 S. Euclid, St.  
Louis, MO 63110.

2 Now at Department of Neurology, University of Maryland School of  
Medicine, 22 S. Greene, Baltimore, MD 21201.

# ABSTRACT

We have employed three tasks, developed by cognitive psychologists to study attention, with a population of six brain injured subjects in a rehabilitation program. Each of the tasks had been validated by studies with unilateral stroke patients and appear to provide a means of examining the relative efficiency of the two cerebral hemisphere when demands upon them are placed in conflict. We found that five of the six patients had imbalances between the two hemispheres. Four of them met our definition of attentional because the imbalance interacted with cues. The results show that the three tests converge on a common picture of cerebral imbalances in these brain injury patients and may relate to some aspects of their normal functioning.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

Unilateral left and right hemisphere lesions produce numerous well documented neuropsychological consequences (DeRenzi, 1982). Some of these sequels are attentional (Nissen, 1986; Posner & Rafal, 1986), involving anatomical systems related to the selection of information for conscious detection. Such attentional deficits can often be demonstrated in tasks involving conflict between stimuli (Posner & Presti, 1987).

For example, patients with left hemisphere lesions have difficulty selecting a verbal input when it conflicts with a simultaneous spatial command. Patients with right hemisphere damage show the reverse pattern (Walker, Posner & Friedrich, 1983). Similarly, patients with parietal lobe lesions often have great difficulty when an event in the contralesional visual field is in conflict with one in the ipsilesional field. In severe cases these patients may be completely unaware of contralesional targets while in milder cases the target may be detected but with longer latency (DeRenzi, 1982; Posner, Walker, Friedrich & Rafal, 1984).

These findings from patients with focal unilateral lesions demonstrate the value of cognitive tests for the precise measurement of attentional deficits related to hemisphere imbalance (Posner & Rafal, 1986). The conflict tasks, for example, detect residual attentional imbalance well after standard neurological methods suggest that the patient's performance is normal (Posner, et al, 1984).

Clinical neurology has long used imbalances between the two eyes as a means of detecting subtle insults to the cranial nerves at the level of the midbrain (Mesulam, 1985). In recent years there has been much evidence of the specialization of the two cerebral hemispheres in the performance of higher level cognitive and emotional activity (Mesulam, 1985). It seems likely the imbalances between the two cerebral hemispheres, as reflected by cognitive tasks involving conflict may be of similar benefit in clinical neuropsychology. To explore this hypothesis it is of importance to measure these imbalances and to relate them to everyday behaviors likely to be differentially mediated by the two cerebral hemispheres.

It is now common for patients recovering from closed head injury to spend an extended period of time in a rehabilitation program, often supervised by a clinical psychologist. The opportunity for extended detailed observation of their classroom and extracurricular performance makes patients participating in such programs ideal subjects for relating attentional imbalances to disturbances in everyday behaviors.

As a step toward investigating this relationship, six patients undergoing therapy at the Head Injury Resource Center of Washington University were tested with several standard neuropsychological tests and three special attentional paradigms sensitive to attentional deficits in patients with unilateral lesions. We then examined clinical ratings of their academic performance and social interaction to determine if imbalances found in our tests might relate to aspects of everyday life

involving attention. Because of the limited sample size this study serves primarily to provide validation of our tests to individual brain injured patients and as pilot data toward the goal of relating attentional imbalances to natural performance.

### COGNITIVE ATTENTION TASKS

Covert orienting of visual spatial attention (Task 1) (Posner & Presti, 1987; Posner et al, 1984). This task involves the detection of a target stimulus (an asterisk) which occurs within one of two boxes located five degrees to the left or right of a fixation cross (Figure 1). Trials are either cued (80%) or uncued (20%). Cues consist of a brightening of one of the two peripheral boxes and remain present until target detection. The majority of cued trials (80%) are valid, with the targets occurring on the brightened side. The remaining 20% of the cued trials are invalid, with the target occurring on the side that is not brightened. Inter-trial interval is 1000 msec for cued and uncued trials. The interval between brightening of a peripheral box and target onset was either 100 or 800 msec for the cued trials (valid and invalid). Uncued targets occurred 1100 or 1900 msec following previous target onset.

Subjects received three blocks of 254 trials. Instructions were to fixate on the central cross and to press the single response key with the index finger of the dominant hand as rapidly as possible following target detection. Subjects were informed that most trials would be cued and that most cues would be valid.

#### Fig. 1

Covert Orienting of Spatial Attention with Central Cues (Task 2) (Posner, 1980; Posner, et al, 1984). The purpose of this task was to study orienting from central rather than peripheral cues. With the exception of cue location, the design was very similar to that of Task 1. Cues consisted of either a directional arrow (80% valid) or a neutral plus sign. Subjects were explicitly instructed to shift their attention, but not their eyes, in the direction indicated by the arrow. Targets followed cue onset at intervals of 100, 500, 800 or 1000 msec.

Selective Attention to Linguistic and Spatial Information (Task 3) (Posner & Henik, 1982; Walker, Friedrich & Posner, 1983). As described above, this task involves selective attention to a specified stimulus mode (spatial or linguistic). For each block, subjects were instructed to attend to one of two types of information (arrow or word). They had to press one of two keys depending on whether the instructed stimulus mode indicated 'left' or 'right'. The attended stimulus was presented in one of three conditions: either alone, with redundant information or conflicting information from the unattended modality. Redundant and conflicting

stimuli were centered on the CRT and arrayed vertically (Figure 2). These three stimulus conditions were randomly mixed within a 96 trial block. Blocks were presented within an ABBA/BAAB design (A = attend arrow, B = attend word).

Fig. 2

---

Although never published, we had studied unilateral stroke patients on a task similar to 3, but never published the data (Walker, Posner & Friedrich, 1987). Since the current version was slightly different, we ran 12 normal subjects, six patients with unilateral right hemisphere lesions (from strokes) and three patients with unilateral left hemisphere lesions (from strokes) to validate our previous results. The results conformed well to our previous findings and are shown in Table 1. For the normal subjects, there was no significant difference in RT between the attend arrow and the attend word instructions and the two conditions yielded approximately equivalent interfering effects when placed in conflict. In contrast, the patients with right hemisphere lesions were slower and made many more errors when attending to an arrow in the conflict situation than when attending to the word. Several found the conflict task so difficult that they responded incorrectly (i.e. on the basis of the conflicting stimulus mode) more than correctly. The left hemisphere damaged patients showed good performance on the arrow condition, but were very slow and made many errors in the word condition. Errors were most common in the word condition. Despite the small sample size, these findings were confirmed with parametric statistical tests.

Table 1

---

#### SUBJECTS

Subjects were six clients, four male and two female, recruited from the Head Injury Resource Center. All subjects received a formal neuropsychological evaluation as part of the admissions procedure. All were involved in an intensive program of daily therapy and rehabilitation. Both formal neuropsychological and less formal treatment notes were thus available for comparison with cognitive test results. Demographic information pertaining to the six subjects is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

---

### Group Data

The brain injured subjects were compared to twelve normal controls on tasks one and three. The group data for these tasks are shown in Figures 3 and 4.

Figure 3 displays median reaction times in Task 1 for valid and invalid trials at the 100 msec cue to target interval. Contamination of the data by eye movements is impossible at this short delay. Non cue trials are from the two delays combined. Inspection of the control data reveals the expected pattern, with valid cues facilitating performance in comparison to invalid cues in both visual fields. The most striking aspect of the grouped head injury data is how closely it resembles the normal pattern. Although slower than controls by approximately 100 msec, the head injured subjects generate the expected pattern of facilitation and inhibition.

Figure 4 shows group data for the arrow/word decision (Task 3). Control subjects tend to respond faster to an arrow than to a word and show slightly, but not significantly, more interference of the arrow in the attend word conflict trials than of the word in the attend arrow conflict trials. This pattern is replicated in a slower and exaggerated fashion by the head injured subjects.

### Fig. 3,4

Although many studies have considered patients with closed head injury as a homogenous group, it is clear that differences due to lesion size and location may affect task performance. Combining the data of our six subjects is misleading because differences between subjects are obscured by averaging. It is not surprising then that the resulting pattern differs only in speed from that of healthy controls. It is more useful to look at the patterns of performance of the three tasks in individual subjects, and to attempt to relate these patterns to neuropsychological and observational parameters.

### Individual Subjects

Individual patient scores for the three cognitive tests are given in Tables 3, 4 and 5. To simplify the presentation we again present reaction times for valid and invalid trials at the 100 msec interval only. The results for each subject are discussed individually below.

Subject 1: Subject 1 shows a pattern of attentional deficits that is consistent across the tasks. At the 100 msec delay, Subject 1 shows a pattern of covert orienting on Task 1 very similar to that seen in patients with left parietal lesion (See Table 3). This pattern is characterized by particular difficulty in shifting attention contralesionally when there has



been an ipsilesional cue. It is reflected in very long reaction times to invalidly cued targets in the right visual field. On Task 2 (Table 4), Subject 1 is slower to respond to targets in the right visual field at the 100 msec delay. In addition, the validity effect appears to be larger for right than left sided targets.

Subject 1 evidences a large advantage of the arrow over the word on the task of selective attention (Table 5). Moreover, the word shows a much larger interference effect from the arrow in the conflict condition than the arrow shows from the word.

In summary, the cognitive tests converge to suggest that subject 1 may have an attention deficit that is left hemisphere predominant. Neuropsychological test results are consistent with this hypothesis. In particular, performance on language measures tapping naming, comprehension, and repetition are well within the aphasic range, indicating significant left-hemisphere dysfunction. Lateralizing measures were somewhat more suggestive of left than right hemisphere dysfunction. Additionally, clinical observations are notable for problems caused by poor memory, inflexibility, and concreteness. These problems are most severe when they interact with linguistic demands. It is worth noting that memory problems were accompanied by confabulation when the patient first entered the program. In addition to the effects on recent memory, the patient's basic fund of knowledge (semantic memory) and remote memory for events (episodic memory) were both impaired. For example, he was sometimes unable to demonstrate any knowledge about the characteristics or uses of familiar objects, and he was sometimes unable to remember significant events in his life as far back as his childhood. Although memory had improved substantially by the end of treatment, evidence of intrusion was still present on formal testing. Subject 1 was consistently unaware of the extent of his deficits and particularly their implications. Interestingly, on the other hand, he shows a strength in his ability to maintain a focus of attention in structured and repetitive tasks, and this proved to be an asset vocationally for him.

Subject 2: Subject 2 obtains a pattern of cognitive test results that is almost the opposite of Subject 1 and appears to exemplify a right hemisphere attentional imbalance. This effect is rather weakly demonstrated on Task 1 (Table 3) in which the left visual field is systematically worse than the right only in the invalid condition, but the trend is confirmed on Task 2 (Table 4) where performance is generally worse in the left visual field. Subject 2 is the only subject for whom word processing on Task 3 is faster than arrow processing (Table 5). Interference effects appear to be approximately equal for the arrow and the word.

In spite of severe bilateral injury on acute CT scans, neuropsychological test results are most consistent with the right hemisphere deficit hypothesis suggested by the cognitive tasks. Subject 2

obtained a WAIS-R Performance IQ 15 points below his Verbal IQ of 113. Of note, finger tapping is within normal limits for the right index finger but severely impaired for the left. Informal observations, in fact, suggest that subject 2's areas of greatest functional impairment are not in attention but in organization and memory. Although memory tests were generally within normal limits by the end of the program, the pre-program testing had shown a pattern consistent with a consolidation deficit in verbal memory. It is of further interest that Subject 2 often remembers a fact or happening but cannot associate such information with the context in which it occurs. He has difficulty recognizing the memory problem and the implications of this problem, and thus, is not consistent in compensating for this deficit. Finally, he is often noted to show irritability and difficulty with temper control.

Subject 3: Subject 3 shows the most complex pattern of the head injured group on cognitive testing. On Task 1 (see Table 3), Subject 3 was slower to respond to invalid stimuli in the left visual field. On closer inspection, however, the advantage of cues for targets in the left visual field appears to be normal. Targets in the right visual field, in contrast, failed to show a validity effect at the 100 msec delay. Task 2 data (Table 4) provide confirmation of a left rather than a right hemisphere deficit, as detection of right visual field stimuli is much slower than of left visual field stimuli, especially for invalid trials. Performance on the arrow/word task further supports a left hemisphere attentional imbalance with slower processing for the word and a greater interference effect of the arrow (Table 5).

Neuropsychological data for Subject 3 are consistent with the cognitive test results. Although not grossly aphasic, Subject 3 shows deficits in many realms of verbal functioning. Like Subject 1, he was impaired in naming and auditory-verbal comprehension, and is especially impaired with repetition. Phoneme and rhythm discrimination were also notably disturbed. There was a right homonymous hemianopsia and indications of a right visual neglect. Although the left-hemisphere injury is obvious from testing, it is worth noting this subject had a partial right temporal lobectomy. During functional activities in therapies, he does show slowed ability to learn secondary to verbal memory and auditory processing deficits. Yet, this patient demonstrates good nonverbal skills, excellent orientation to his surroundings, and good interpersonal/social skills. In spite of comparatively severe deficits, he demonstrates strengths in his awareness of and ability to compensate for deficits.

Subject 4: Subject 4 shows slightly longer RTs toward stimuli in the left visual field at 100 msec on Task 1 (Table 3). In addition, the data reveal difficulty in orienting attention to the left side (no validity effect). Task 2 also reveals a reduced validity effect on the left (Table 4). These results suggest a right hemisphere deficit that involves attention. Data from the arrow/word task (Table 5) show a minimal advantage of spatial over linguistic processing and the symmetric nature of

the interference effects are compatible with a slight deficit in right hemisphere processing.

While neuropsychological testing of Subject 4 indicated there was some evidence of anterior left hemisphere dysfunction (i.e., Visual Naming and Controlled Oral Word Association were below the 12th percentile), the pattern was generally supportive of right hemisphere predominant dysfunction. For example, her performance IQ was 13 points below her verbal IQ of 91. Although Subject 4 showed a relative strength in Block Design, she demonstrated deficits in attention to visual detail, visual sequencing, puzzle construction, and psychomotor speed. During initial evaluation, she also demonstrated a scanning deficit, omitting items on the left side of the page. These results are consistent with the left frontal injury caused by depressed skull fracture and the posterior right hemisphere contusion visualized on the CT scan. Clinically, residual visual-spatial deficits were apparent in affecting her attention to surroundings and her ability to integrate visual details into an organized whole. Difficulties were also present in mental flexibility, concreteness, interpretation of nonverbal signals, and comprehension of subtleties/humor. Additionally, Subject 4 demonstrated lack of awareness of the deficit areas, as well as their implications in her life. Like Subject 1, Subject 4 was able to sustain attention during structured tasks.

Subject 5: Subject 5 stands out on Tasks 1 and 2 in showing a slower RT to left visual field stimuli, thus a right hemisphere deficit that does not interact with cue type and thus does not appear to be attentional in our sense. Performance on Task 3 was better for the arrow than for the word alone. In addition, while word processing was considerably slowed by the presence of conflicting arrows, arrow processing was largely uninfluenced by the presence of conflicting words.

Subject 5 showed very few deficits on formal neuropsychological evaluation, and has obtained a Bachelor of Science Degree since her injury. Fine motor coordination was slow bilaterally, more so for the left hand than for the right. The most striking aspect of the neuropsychological examination was a severe deficit on the Tactual Performance Test with the left hand. This latter pattern of performance is generally considered to be suggestive of right parietal dysfunction. Clinically, Subject 5 was characterized by susceptibility to distraction, concreteness, and impulsivity. Her most severe functional deficits, however, were in the areas of social and interpersonal skills, including difficulty recognizing the emotions of others and monitoring appropriate verbal output. Additionally, Subject 5 was unaware of her deficits and their implications into her life. She also was characterized by an inability to experience negative affect. This reduced the likelihood that effective response to confrontation would result in behavior change.

Subject 6: Subject 6 shows no evidence of imbalance. Performance on the two spatial orienting tasks is largely symmetric. Reaction times for

Task 3 are faster for the arrow than the word alone. Arrow processing, though, was inhibited in both redundant and conflict conditions by the presence of the word while word processing was facilitated by the arrow in the redundant condition and inhibited by the arrow in the conflict condition.

In contrast to the weak results on cognitive testing, neuropsychological test results from Subject 6 are compatible with a deficit that is right hemisphere predominant. This is most strikingly indicated by a significantly lower Performance IQ, as compared to Verbal IQ. Testing revealed both verbal and nonverbal memory deficits, with great visual memory impairment apparent than verbal. This pattern of memory impairment would be consistent with the right temporal lobe atrophy on CT scan, although this atrophy may have preceded the injury. Left hand finger tapping was mildly impaired in comparison to the right. Clinically, attentional problems were evident, including attention to detail, attention to surroundings, and concentrating on several items simultaneously. Additional difficulties were observed in organization, integration of the parts into the whole, and in recognition of faces. Subject 6 demonstrated excellent awareness of his deficit areas, as well as good ability to compensate for them.

#### DISCUSSION

The goal of this project was twofold: 1) to determine if attentional imbalances could be measured in head injured patients using cognitive tasks; and 2) to relate attentional imbalances between the hemispheres to formal and less formal neuropsychological measures. Although our small sample size precludes firm conclusions, several interesting findings emerged.

Hemispheric imbalances were found in five of the six brain damaged subjects (all but Subject 6) suggesting that such imbalances may be quite frequent following closed head injury. In our sample, four of the patients with hemispheric imbalances probably had an attentional component to their deficit as evidenced by an interaction between cue type and hemispheric asymmetry on the tasks of covert spatial orienting.

Performance on the arrow/word attention task was consistent with the covert orienting task in all four subjects with attentional imbalances. We treated the arrow/word task as attentional because the unilateral patients (see Table 1) had so much more trouble in the conflict situation. An alternative is that the deficit arises in the difficulty of patients in processing the word or arrow condition even when it is not presented with conflicting information. This appears to be particularly true of patient 3.

These attentional imbalances occurred in the presence of bilateral injury in all four cases. Some factor such as the comparative location or

volume of injury most likely accounts for the imbalance. The presence of both right and left hemisphere imbalances in different patients further demonstrates the importance of considering each patient individually rather than as a homogenous group.

These preliminary data raise the issue of whether the imbalances found in the cognitive task are greater than one might expect from the normal population. We have only a little data on this issue. Three of the patients had an imbalance based primarily upon right-left differences in the invalid cue condition of Task 1. These differences are 132, 74 and 48 millisecond respectively. Of thirty normal subjects run in this test only three had differences in this condition as large as 50 millisecond. At least two of the patient values do seem quite large to be normal. One subject was diagnosed primarily on the lack of a validity effect in one field but not the other. This pattern was detected in only three of our 30 normals. Finally, one patient was diagnosed largely on the reversal of the normal pattern in the arrow/word study and this pattern was larger than we found in any of the twelve normals studied. These findings suggest that the differences found in our patients were the result of the cerebral injuries but further work would be necessary to establish the general validity of the testing methods.

Two of the four patients with attentional imbalance were hypothesized to have greater left hemisphere dysfunction. Both performed well within the aphasic range on several language parameters, and had neuropsychological evaluations consistent with a primary left hemisphere deficit. The remaining two patients with attentional imbalances on cognitive testing were hypothesized to have predominant right hemisphere dysfunction. In addition to other neuropsychological indications of a primary right hemisphere deficit, both patients suffered from social/emotional adjustment problems and depression. A third subject with evidence of greater right hemisphere dysfunction without an imbalance (Subject 5) suffers from serious social and interpersonal difficulties. This relation may suggest an important link between the imbalance found in cognitive tasks and observational ratings of behavior and personality during therapy.

Our three tasks appear to converge on the side of primary deficit in most of the head injury patients. In addition, it appears that they relate well to patterns of lateralization in neuropsychological evaluation. It remains to be determined if these tests provide a sufficiently sensitive measure of imbalances to be useful as a tool for diagnosis and recovery. In addition, we need to know much more about the relationship of such imbalances to performance outside the laboratory.

A useful step would be to relate performance on cognitive tasks over time to neuropsychological and functional measures of recovery. There is some evidence (e.g. Morrow & Ratcliffe, 1987) that the size of the validity effect on the peripheral orienting task correlates with clinical recovery

from left sided visual neglect. Replication and expansion of this result would serve as further evidence for the usefulness of simple cognitive measures in the evaluation of attentional deficits and their remediation.

## REFERENCES


- DeRenzi, E. (1982) Disorders of Space Exploration and Cognition. John Wiley, New York.
- Mesulam, M. (1985) Mental state assessment of young and elderly adults in behavioral neurology. In Principles of Behavioral Neurology, Mesulam, M. (ed.), F.A. Davis Company.
- Mesulam, M. (1981) A cortical network for directed attention and unilateral neglect. *Annals of Neurology*, 10, 309-325.
- Morrow, L.A. & Ratcliffe, G. (1987) Attentional mechanisms in clinical neglect. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, Vol. 9, Number 1, (Abstract).
- Nissen, M.J. (1986) Neuropsychology of attention and memory. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation* 1(3):13-21.
- Posner, M.I. (1980) Orienting of attention. The 7th Sir F. C. Bartlett Lecture. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*. 32:3-25.
- Posner, M.I. & Henik, A. (1983) Isolating representational systems. In J. Beck, B. Hope and A. Rosenfeld (eds.), *Human and Machine Vision*, New York:Academic Press, 395-412.
- Posner, M.I. and Presti, D. (1987) Selective attention and cognitive control. *Trends in Neuroscience*, 10, 12-17.
- Posner, M.I. and Rafal, R. D. (1986) Cognitive theories of attention and the rehabilitation of attentional deficit. In R.J. Meir, L. Diller, and A.C. Benton (eds.), *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*. London:Churchill-Livingston.
- Posner, M.I., Walker, J.A., Friedrich, F. and Rafal, R. (1984) Effects of parietal lobe injury on covert orienting of visual attention. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 4, 1863-1874.
- Walker, J.A., Friedrich, F. & Posner, M.I. (1983) Spatial conflict in parietal lesions. Paper presented to International Neuropsychological Society, San Diego.

#### FIGURE CAPTIONS


- Figure 1.** Cue conditions for Task 1. Valid trials are ones in which the target occurs on the cued side. Invalid trials are ones in which the target occurs on the opposite side of the cue.
- Figure 2.** Stimulus conditions for arrow/word task.
- Figure 3.** Mean Reaction Time as a function of cue condition for Task 1. Data are from valid, invalid and no cue trials for 6 closed head injury patients and 12 normal controls. All cued data are from the 100 msec cue to target condition.
- Figure 4.** Mean Reaction Time as a function of condition for Task 3. Data are for 6 closed head injury patients and 12 normal controls.





VALID TRIAL



+





Cue





Target

INVALID TRIAL




Cue



Target

FIGURE 2

	<u>Alone</u>	<u>Redundant</u>	<u>Conflict</u>
Attend Arrow	➔	➔ Right	Left ➔
Attend Word		Right	Right
	Right	➔	➔






TABLE 1  
Mean Reaction Times (and Percentage Errors)  
for the Arrow/Word Task

	ARROW			WORD		
	ALONE	REDUNDANT	CONFLICT	ALONE	REDUNDANT	CONFLICT
RH N=6	700 (10.2)	800 (4.7)	878 (43.5)	738 (5.3)	760 (2.3)	801 (2.9)
LH N=3	591 (5.6)	666 (5.2)	654 (6.5)	666 (5.2)	652 (1.0)	748 (28.3)
CONTROL N=12	507 (0.5)	533 (0.5)	558 (3.1)	541 (1.8)	541 (0.8)	575 (3.3)

TABLE 2

SIX HEAD INJURED SUBJECTS

	<u>GENDER</u>	<u>AGE</u>	<u>EDUCATION</u>	<u>TIME POST ONSET</u>	<u>SENSORY DEFICIT</u>	<u>NEUROLOGICAL INFORMATION</u>
1.	M	28	12	1 Year	-color blind -right ear -conductive hearing loss -impaired visual tracking with left eye in nasal direction	-rt. frontal hemorrhage -EEG showed abnormal LH activity -lengthy period of post traumatic amnesia and agitation generalized cerebral
2.	M	20	12	18 months		-hemorrhage in left sylvian fissure -lucency in left peripheral thalamus + left temporal lobe -lucency in right basal ganglia -craniotomy with evacuation of right temporal hematoma
3.	M	24	12	1 year	-right homonymous hemianopia	-left occipital skull fracture -diffuse region of low density in left temporal/parietal occipital area -region of low density in right frontal lobe -right temporal contusion with craniotomy -left to right midline shift
4.	F	24	16	9 months		-depressed left frontal skull fracture -left frontal contusion -right occipital/ parietal contusion -left frontal craniotomy with with debridement
5.	F	24	16	9 years		-bilateral intracerebral hematomas -frontal & basal ganglia contusions -right frontal subdural hematoma
6.	M	57	14	2 1/2 yrs.	-5th, 6th, 7th nerve palsy	-basilar skull fracture -right temporal lobe atrophy

TABLE 3

Median RTs (msec) for Brain Injured Subjects in Task 1  
As a Function of Visual Field and Validity  
(100 Millisec Interval)

Subject	VALID		INVALID	
	Left	Right	Left	Right
1	422	440	458	590
2	370	380	455	431
3	412	432	504	430
4	637	593	629	621
5	380	322	395	347
6	344	343	421	398

TABLE 4

Median RTs for Brain Injured Subjects in Task 2  
As a Function of Visual Field and Validity  
(100 Millisec Interval)

Subject	VALID		INVALID	
	Left	Right	Left	Right
1	596	631	652	704
2	403	392	441	404
3	504	567	576	783
4	581	512	608	560
5	476	417	545	492
6	373	382	409	388



TABLE 5

Median RT and Number of Errors ( )  
for Brain Injured Subjects in Task 3  
as a Function of Condition and Conflict

	ARROW			WORD		
	Alone	Redundant	Conflict	Alone	Redundant	Conflict
1	514 (1)	570 (2)	581 (1)	658 (4)	659 (2)	736 (11)
2	586 (1)	602 (1)	627 (2)	531 (0)	544 (1)	555 (1)
3	609 (1)	634 (0)	647 (0)	902 (0)	868 (0)	978 (2)
4	642 (0)	671 (0)	688 (1)	671 (0)	679 (0)	708 (0)
5	557 (1)	589 (0)	585 (3)	596 (0)	562 (0)	671 (3)
6	563 (0)	632 (0)	628 (5)	614 (1)	598 (0)	629 (0)

## Distribution List

DR. PHILLIP L. ACKERMAN UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455	DR. ALAN BADDELEY - MRC APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY UNIT 15 CHAUCER ROAD CAMBRIDGE CB3 3EF ENGLAND	DR. TYRONE CASHMAN AMER. SOC. OF CYBERNETICS 3448 FREMONT AVE. SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55408	DR. GARY ASTON-JONES DEPT. OF BIOLOGY, NYU 1009 MAIN BLDG. WASHINGTON SQUARE NEW YORK, NY 10003	DR. PAT CARPENTER CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. LEON COOPER BROWN UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR NEURAL SCI. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912
DR. BETH ADELSON DEPT. OF COMP. SCIENCE TUFTS UNIVERSITY MEDFORD, MA 02155	DR. JAMES BALLAS GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20057	DR. ALPHONSE CHAPANIS 8415 BELLONA LANE SUITE 210-BUXTON TOWERS BALTIMORE, MD 21204	DR. LYNN A. COOPER LEARNING RAD CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 3939 O'HARA STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. WAYNE GRAY ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, ARMY HUMAN ENG. LAB ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND MD 21005	DR. HAROLD RAMFORD NAT. SCIENCE FDN. 1800 G STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20550	DR. PAUL R. CHATELIER OUSDRE PENTAGON WASH. D.C. 20350-2000	PHIL CUNNIFF COMMANDING OFFICER CODE 732, NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE ENGINEERING KEYPORT, WA 98345	DR. BERT GREEN JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHARLES & 34TH ST. BALTIMORE, MD 21218	DR. HAROLD HAWKINS ONR - CODE 1142PT 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000
DR. ROBERT AHLERS CODE 9711 HUMAN FACTORS LABORATORY NAVAL TRAINING SYSTEMS CTR. ORLANDO, FL 32813	DR. ISAAC BEJAR EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE PRINCETON, NJ 08450	MR. RAYMOND E. CHRISTEL AFHRLMOE BROOKS AFB, TX 78235	BRIAN DALLMAN 3400 TWITTGXS LOWRY AFB, CO 80230-5000	DR. JAMES G. GREENO UNIVERSITY OF CALIF. BERKELEY, CA 94720	PROF. JOHN R. HAYES CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
DR. JOHN ALLEN DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. ALVAH BITTNER NAVAL BIODYNAMICS LAB. NEW ORLEANS, LA 70189	DR. DAVID E. CLEMENT DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208	LT. JOHN DEATON ONR CODE 125 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. WILLIAM GREENOUGH UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. JOAN I. HELLER 505 HADDON ROAD OAKLAND, CA 94606
DR. EARL A. ALLUISI HQ AFHRL (AFSC) BROOKS, AFB TX 78235	DR. JOHN BLAKA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. CHARLES CLIFTON TOBIN HALL DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST, MA 01003	DR. STANLEY DEUTSCH COMMITTEE ON HUMAN FACTORS NAT'L ACAD. OF SCIENCE 2101 CONSTITUTION AVE. WASHINGTON, DC 20418	DR. STEPHANIE DOAN CODE 6021 NAVAL AIR DEV. CTR. WARMINGSTER, PA 18974-5000	
DR. JAMES ANDERSON BROWN UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR NEURAL SCI. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912	SUE BOGNER, ARMY RES. INST. ATTN: PERI-SF 5001 EISENHOWER AV. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333-5600	ASST. CHIEF OF STAFF FOR RES. DEV. TEST & EVAL. NAVAL EDUC. & TR. COM. (N-5) NAS PENSACOLA, FL 32508	DR. R. K. DISMUKES ASSOC. DIR. FOR LIFE SCI. AFOSR ROLLING AFB WASHINGTON, DC 20332	DR. EMANUEL DONCHIN UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	
DR. NANCY S. ANDERSON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742	DR. GORDON R. BOWER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY STANFORD UNIVERSITY STANFORD, CA 94306	DR. MICHAEL COLES UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. NANCY F. HALFF HALFF RESOURCES, INC. 4918 33RD ROAD, NORTH ARLINGTON, VA 22207	MR. RALPH DUSEK ARD CORPORATION 5457 TWINS KNOLLS RD. SUITE 400 COLUMBIA, MD 21045	
DR. ED AIKEN NAVY PERSONNEL RAD CENTER SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-4800	MR. DONALD C. BURG GENERAL PHYSICS CORP. 10650 HICKORY RIDGE RD. COLUMBIA, MD 21044	DR. ALLAN M. COLLINS BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC. 50 MOULTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. MUHAMMAD K. HABIB UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF BIOSTATISTICS CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514	DR. FORD EBNER BROWN UNIV. MED. SCHOOL ANATOMY DEPT. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912	
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, ARI 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. GAIL CARPENTER NORTHEASTERN UNIV. DEPT. OF MATH. SCI. 360 HUNTINGTON AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02115	DR. STANLEY COLLYER OFFICE OF NAVAL TECH. CODE 232 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	PROF. EDWARD HAERTEL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD UNIVERSITY STANFORD, CA 94305	DR. JEFFREY ELMAN UCSD DEPT. OF LING. C-008 LA JOLLA, CA 92093	

DR. RICHARD H. GRANGER DEPT. OF COMP. SCIENCE UNIV. CALIF. AT IRVINE IRVINE, CA 92717	DR. RONALD HAMBLETON PROF. OF EDUC. & PSYCH. UNIV. OF MASS AMHERST HILLS HOUSE AMHERST, MA 01003	DR. WILLIAM EPSTEIN UNIV. OF WISCONSIN BROGDEN PSYCH. BLDG. 1201 W. JOHNSON ST. MADISON, WI 53706	DR. L. E. GILES AFOSR BOLLING AFB WASHINGTON, DC 20332	DR. EARL HUNT DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF WASHINGTON SEATTLE, WA 98105	DR. RUTH KAMFER UNIV. OF MINN.-ELLIOTT HALL DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY 75 E. RIVER ROAD MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455
DR. STEVEN GRANT DEPT. OF BIOLOGY, NYU 1009 MAIN BUILDING WASHINGTON SQUARE NEW YORK NY 10003	DR. CHERYL HAMEL NTSC ORLANDO, FL 32813	DR. K. ANDERS ERICSSON UNIV. OF COLORADO DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOULDER, CO 80309	DR. EUGENE E. GILROYE ONR DETACHMENT 1030 E. GREEN PASADENA, CA 91106-3455	DR. ED HUTCHINS, UCSD INTELLIGENT SYSTMS GROUP INST. FOR COG. SCI. (C 15) LA JOLLA, CA 92093	DR. MILTON S. KATZ ARMY RES. INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
DR. JEROME FELDMAN UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER COMP. SCIENCE DEPT. ROCHESTER, NY 14627	DR. P. HELMERSEN UNIVERSITY OF OSLO DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOX 1094 OSLO 3, NORWAY	COL DENNIS W. JARVI COMMANDER AFHRL BROOKS, AFB 78335-5601	DR. JOSEPH C. OGIEN COMP. SCI. LABORATORY SRI INTERNATIONAL 333 RAVENSWOOD AVE. MENLO PARK, CA 94025	DR. ALICE ISEN DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF MARYLAND CATONSVILLE, MD 21228	DR. DEMETRIOS KARIS GRUMMAN AEROSPACE CORP. MS C04-14 BETHPAGE, NY 11714
DR. PAUL FELTOVICH SCH. OF MEDICINE MED. EDUC. DEPT. P.O. BOX 3926 SPRINGFIELD, IL 62708	DR. STEVEN HILLYARD DEPT. OF NEUROSCI. UCSD LA JOLLA, CA 92093	DR. JOSEPH E. JOHNSON ASST. DEAN-GRAD. STUDIES COLLEGE OF SCI. & MATH UNIV. OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208	DR. LLOYD HUMPHREYS UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY 603 E. DANIEL STREET CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. DAVID KRANTZ 2 WASHINGTON SQ. VILLAGE APT. #151 NEW YORK, NY 10012	DR. CLAYTON LEWIS UNIV. OF COLORADO DEPT. OF COMP. SCI. CAMPUS BOX 430 BOULDER, CO 80309
DR. CRAIG I. FIELDS ARPA 1400 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON, VA 22209	DR. GEOFFREY HINTON COMP. SCIENCE DEPT. UNIV. OF TORONTO 10 KINGS COLLEGE RD. TORONTO, CANADA M5S 1A4	CDR TOM JONES ONR CODE 125 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. WENDY KELLOGG 18H T.J. WATSON RES. CTR. P.O. BOX 218 YORKTOWN HTS., NY 10598	DR. DAVID R. LAMBERT NAVAL OCEAN SYS. CTR. CODE 4411 271 CATALINA BLVD. SAN DIEGO, CA 92153-6800	DR. BOB LLOYD DEPT. OF GEOGRAPHY UNIV. OF S. CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29308
DR. GAIL FLEISCHAKER MARGULIS LAB BIOLOGICAL SCI. CTR. 2 CUMMINGTON STREET BOSTON, MA 02215	DR. JIM HOLLAN INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS GRP. INST. FOR COG. SCIENCE UCSD LA JOLLA, CA 92093	MR. DANIEL B. JONES US NUCLEAR REG. COMM. DIV. OF HUMAN FACTORS SAFETY WASHINGTON, DC 20555	DR. STEVEN W. KEELF DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF OREGON EUGENE, OR 97403	DR. PAT LANGLEY UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF INFO. & COMP. SCI. IRVINE, CA 92717	DR. FREDERIC M. LORD EDUC. TESTING SERV. PRINCETON, NJ 08541
DR. JANE M. FLINN DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. JOHN HOLLAND UNIV. OF MICHIGAN 2113 EAST ENGINEERING ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. DOUGLAS H. JONES THATCHER JONES ASSOC. P.O. BOX 6640 10 TRAFALGAR COURT LAWRENCEVILLE, NY 08648	DR. MARCY LANSMAN UNIV. OF N. CAROLINA THE L.L. THURSTONE LAB. DAVIE HALL 013A CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514	DR. GARY LYNCH UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA CTR. FOR THE NEUROBIOLOGY OF LEARNING & MEMORY IRVINE, CA 92717	DR. DON LYON P.O. BOX 44 HIGLEY, AZ 85336
DR. MICHEL GALLAGHER UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514	DR. MELISSA HOLLAND ARMY RES. INST. FOR THE BEH. & SOCIAL SCIENCES 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. JANE JORGENSEN UNIVERSITY OF OSLO INST. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOX 1094, BLINDERN OSLO, NORWAY	DR. JILL LARKIN CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. WILLIAM L. BALLOY CHIEF OF NAVAL ED. & TR. NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA, FL 32508	DR. EVANS MANDES DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY 4400 UNIVERSITY DR. FAIRFAX, VA 22030
DR. R. EDWARD GEISELMAN DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES, CA 90024	DR. JAMES HOWARD DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY HUMAN PERFORMANCE LAB. CATHOLIC UNIV. OF AMERICA WASHINGTON, DC 20064	DR. MARCEL JUST CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. ROBERT LAWLER INFORMATION SCIENCES, FRL GTS LABORATORIES, INC. 40 STYLVAN ROAD WALTHAM, MA 02254		
DR. DON GENTNER CENTER FOR HUMAN INFORMATION PROCESSING UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LA JOLLA, CA 92093	DR. KEITH HOLYOAK UNIV. OF MICHIGAN HUMAN PERFORMANCE CTR. 310 PACKARD ROAD ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. DANIEL KAJANEMAN UNIV. OF BR. COL.-PSYCH. #154-3053 MAIN MALL VANCOUVER, BR. COLUMBIA CANADA V6T 1Z7			

DR. RONALD KNOLL BELL LABORATORIES MURRAY HILL, NJ 07974	DR. ALAN M. LESSGOLD LEARNING RAD CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH PITTSBURGH, PA 15260	DR. SANDRA P. MARSHALL DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SAN DIEGO STATE UNIV. SAN DIEGO, CA 92182	DR. TOM MORAN XEROX PARC 3333 COYOTE HILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94304	DAIRA PAULSON CODE 52-TRAINING SYSTEMS NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800
DR. SYLVAN KORNBLUM UNIV. OF MICHIGAN MENTAL HEALTH RES. INST. 205 WASHTENAW PLACE ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. JIM LEVIN DEPT. OF EDUC. PSYCH. 210 EDUCATION BUILDING 1310 SOUTH SIXTH STREET CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820-6990	DR. RICHARD E. MAYER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106	MR. MELVIN D. MONTEMERLO NASA HEADQUARTERS RTS-6 WASHINGTON, DC 20546	DR. HAROLD F. O'NEIL, JR. SCHOOL OF EDUC. WPH 801 DEPT. OF EDUC., PSYCH. & TECHNOLOGY, USC LOS ANGELES, CA 90089-0031
DR. STEPHEN KOSSLYN HARVARD UNIVERSITY 1236 WILLIAM JAMES HALL 33 KIRKLAND ST. CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. JOHN LEVINE LEARNING RAD CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH PITTSBURGH, PA 15260	JAMES MCBRIDE, PSYCH. CORP C/O HARCOURT, BRACE, JAVANOVICH, INC. 1150 WEST 6TH STREET SAN DIEGO, CA 92101	DR. WILLIAM MONTAGUE NPRDC CODE 13 SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800	DR. MICHAEL OBERLIN NAVAL TRAINING SYS. CTR. CODE 711 ORLANDO, FL 32813-7100
DR. KENNETH KOTOVSKY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY COMM. COLLEGE OF ALLEGHENY 800 ALLEGHENY AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15333	DR. MICHAEL LEVINE EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY 210 EDUCATION BLDG. UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS CHAMPAIGN, IL 61801	DR. JAY MCLELLAND DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	ONR, CODE 1142PT 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000 (6 COPIES)	DR. STELLAN OHLSSON LEARNING RAD CTR. UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 3939 O'HARA STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
DR. RANDY MUMAW PROGRAM MANAGER TRAINING RES. DIVISION 1100 S. WASHINGTON ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	DR. JAMES MCMICHAEL ASST. FOR MPT RES., DEV. AND STUDIES, OP 01B7 WASHINGTON, DC 20370	SPEC. ASST. FOR MARINE CORP MATTERS ONR CODE 00MC 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. JESSE ORLANSKY INST. FOR DEFENSE ANALYSIS 1801 N. BEAUREGARD ST. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22311	DIR., RES. PROG., ONR 800 NORTH QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000
DR. ALLEN MUNRO BEH. TECHNOLOGY LABORATORIES - USC 1845 S. ELENA AVE., 4TH FL. REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277	DR. GAIL MCKOON, CAS/ PSYCHOLOGY, KRESGE #230 NORTHWESTERN UNIV. 1859 SHERIDAN ROAD EVANSTON, IL 60201	DR. GLEN OSGA NOSC, CODE 441 SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800	MR. RAYMOND C. SIDORSKY ARMY RESEARCH INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	
DR. MANPOWER & PERS. LAB. NPRDC (CODE 06) SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800	DR. JOE MCLACHLAN NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800	DR. JUDITH ORASANU ARMY RESEARCH INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. HERBERT A. SIMON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	
DR. RICHARD NISBETT UNIV. OF MICHIGAN INST. FOR SOC. RES. ROOM 5361 ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. GEORGE A. MILLER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GREEN HALL, PRINCETON PRINCETON, NJ 08540	DR. ROBERT F. PASNAK DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. LAUREN RESNICK LEARNING RAD CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 3939 O'HARA STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. ZITA M. SIMUTIS INSTRUCTIONAL TECH. SYSTEMS AREA, ARI 5001 EISENHOWER ST. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
DR. MARY JO NISSEN UNIV. OF MINNESOTA N218 ELLIOTT HALL MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455	DR. BARBARA MEANS HUMAN RES. RES. ORG. 1100 SOUTH WASHINGTON ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	PROF. SEYMOUR PAPERT 20C-109 MIT CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	DR. FRED REIF PHYSICS DEPARTMENT UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY, CA 94720	DR. H. WALLACE SINAIKO MANPOWER RES. & ADV. SERV. SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION 801 N. PITT STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314
DEPUTY TECHNICAL DIRECTOR NPRDC CODE 01A SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800	DR. ROBERT MISLEVY EDUCATION TESTING SERV. PRINCETON, NJ 08541	DIR. TECH. PROGRAMS ONR CODE 12 800 NORTH QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. JAMES A. REGGIA UNIV. OF MD SCH. OF MED. DEPARTMENT OF NEUROLOGY 22 S. GREENE STREET BALTIMORE, MD 21201	DR. DERBE SLEMAN STANFORD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD, CA 94305

DR. JAMES PAULSON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY P.O. BOX 751 PORTLAND, OR 97207	DR. LYNN BIDER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. EDWAKU E. SMITH BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC. 50 MOULTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. KATHRYN SPOHR BROWN UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY PROVIDENCE, RI 02912	DR. K. TATSUOKA CERL 253 ENGINEERING RES. LAB. URBANA, IL 61801	DR. HOWARD WAINER DIV. OF PSYCH. A EDUC. TESTING SERV. PRINCETON, NJ 08541
DR. PETER POLSON UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOULDER, CO 80309	DR. MARK D. RECKASE ACT P.O. BOX 168 IOWA CITY, IA 52243	DR. ALFRED F. SMODE SENIOR SCIENTIST CODE 07A NAVAL TRAINING SYS. CTR. ORLANDO, FL 32813	DR. ROBERT STERNBERG DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY YALE UNIVERSITY BOX 11A, YALE STATION NEW HAVEN, CT 06520	DR. MARTIN A. TOLCOTT 3001 VEAZEY TERR., NW APT. 1617 WASHINGTON, DC 20008	DR. GIL RICARD MAIL STOP C04-14 GRUMMAN AEROSP. CORP. BETHPAGE, NY 11714
DR. JAMES W. PELLEGRINO UC - SANTA BARBARA DEPT. OF PSYCH. SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106	DR. MARY C. POTTER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY MIT (E-10-03) CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	DR. ROBERT F. SMITH DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DR. FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. ROBERT TSUTAKAWA UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI DEPT. OF STATISTICS 222 MATH SCIENCES BLDG. COLUMBIA, MO 65211	DR. DAVID RUMELHART CENTER FOR HUMAN INFORMATION PROC. UNIV. OF CALIF. LA JOLLA, CA 92093	
DR. NANCY PENNINGTON UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO GRAD. SCH. OF MED. 1101 E. 58TH ST. CHICAGO, IL 60637	DR. JOSEPH PSOTKA ATTN: PERI-C ARMY RESEARCH INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. LINDA B. SMITH DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405	DR. DOUGLAS TOWNE BSHAVIORAL TECH. LABS 1845 S. ELENA AVENUE REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277		
DR. RAY PEREZ ART (PERI-IT) 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. KARL PRIBRAM STANFORD UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BLDG. 4201 - JORDAN HALL STANFORD, CA 94305	DR. RICHARD E. SNOW DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY STANFORD UNIVERSITY STANFORD, CA 94306	DR. MAURICE TATSUOKA 220 EDUCATION BLDG. 1310 S. SIXTH ST. CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. ANDREW M. ROSE AM. INST. FOR RES. 1055 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007	
DR. STEVEN PINKER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY E10-018 MIT CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	DR. DANIEL REISBERG DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY NEW SCHOOL FOR SOC. RES. 65 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10003	DR. TED STEINKE DEPT. OF GEOGRAPHY UNIV. OF S. CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208	DR. RICHARD F. THOMPSON STANFORD UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BLDG. 4201-JORDAN HALL STANFORD, CA 94305	DR. WM. B. ROUSE SEARCH TECH., INC. 25-B TECHNOLOGY PKWY. MORCROSS, CA 30092	
DR. SAUL STERNBERG UNIV. OF PENNSYLVANIA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY 3815 WALNUT STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104	DR. STEVE SUOMI NIH BLDG. 31 ROOM B28-15 BETHESDA, MD 20205	DR. MICHAEL J. TURVEY HASKINS LABORATORY 170 CROWN STREET NEW HAVEN, CT 06510	DR. BRAD STIMPSON NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800	DR. E. L. SALTZMAN HASKINS LABORATORIES 270 CROWN STREET NEW HAVEN, CT 06510	
DR. ELLIOT SOLOWAY YALE UNIVERSITY COMPUTER SCI. DEPT. P.O. BOX 2158 NEW HAVEN, CT 06520	DR. H. SWAMINATHAN LAB. OF PSYCHOMETRIC & EVALUATION RESEARCH UNIV. OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST, MA 01003	DR. DAVID VALLS ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS CORP. 2333 UNIVERSITY AVE. SUITE 110 ST. PAUL, MN 55114	DR. FUMIKO SAMEJIMA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF TENNESSEE KNOXVILLE, TN 37916	DR. DAVID J. WEISS N660 ELLIOTT HALL UNIV. OF MINNESOTA 75 E. RIVER ROAD MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455	
DR. ALBERT STEVENS BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC. 1100 MOULTON ST. CAMBRIDGE, MA 02238	DR. KURT VAN LEHN CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. DONALD RUBIN STAT. DEPT., HARVARD SCIENCES CTR., RM. 608 1 OXFORD STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. T. B. SHERIDAN DEPT. OF MECH. ENG. MIT CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	DR. JOE YASATUKE AFHRL/LET LOWRY AFB, CO 80230	
DR. PAUL J. STICHA TRAINING RES. DIV. HUMERO 1100 S. WASHINGTON ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	DR. JOHN TANGNEY AFOSR/ML BOLLING AFB, DC 20332	DR. JERRY VOGT NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR. CODE 51 SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800	DR. HEATHER WILD NAVAL AIR DEV. CENTER CODE 6031 WARMINGSTER, PA 18974-5000	DR. SHIH SUNG WEN JACKSON STATE UNIV. 1325 J. R. LYNCH ST. JACKSON, MS 39217	

DR. MICHAEL J. SAMET  
PERCEPTICS, INC.  
4371 VARIEL AVENUE  
WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91364

DR. ARTHUR SAMUEL  
YALE UNIVERSITY  
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY  
BOX 11A, YALE STATION  
NEW HAVEN, CT 06520

DR. ROGER SCHANK  
YALE UNIVERSITY  
COMP. SCI. DEPARTMENT  
NEW HAVEN, CT 06520

DR. WALTER SCHNEIDER  
LEARNING R&D CTR.  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
3939 O'HARA STREET  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

DR. MICHAEL G. SHAFTO  
ONR CODE 1142PT  
800 N. QUINCY STREET  
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. JANET SCHOFIELD  
LEARNING R&D CENTER  
UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

DR. ROBERT J. SEIDEL  
US ARMY RES. INST.  
5001 EISENHOWER AVE.  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333

CHIEF OF NAVAL ED. & TR.  
LIAISON OFFICE  
AIR FORCE HUMAN RES. LAB.  
OPERATIONS TRAINING DIV.  
WILLIAMS AFB, AZ 85224

DR. DONALD A. NORMAN  
INST. FOR COG. SCI.  
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA  
LA JOLLA, CA 92093

DR. MICHAEL J. ZYDA  
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
CODE 51CK  
MONTEREY, CA 93943-5100

DR. ROBERT A. WISHER  
U.S. ARMY INST. FOR THE  
BEH. & SOC. SCIENCES  
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333

DR. MARTIN F. WISKOFF  
NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR.  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800

MR. JOHN H. WOLFE  
NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR.  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800

GEORGE WONG, BIOSTATISTICS  
MEMORIAL SLOAN-KETTERING  
CANCER CENTER  
1275 YORK AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10021

DR. DONALD WOODWARD  
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH  
CODE 1141NP  
800 NORTH QUINCY STREET  
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. WALLACE WULFECK, III  
NAVY PERS. R&D CENTER  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800

MR. CARL YORK  
SYSTEM DEV. FDN.  
181 LYTTON AVENUE  
SUITE 210  
PALO ALTO, CA 94301

DR. DAVID NAVON  
INST. FOR COGNITIVE SCI.  
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA  
LA JOLLA, CA 92093

DR. ROBERT SASMOR  
ARMY RES. INSTITUTE  
5001 EISENHOWER AVE.  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333

DEFENSE TECH. INFO. CTR.  
CAMERON STATION, BLDG. 5  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314  
ATTN: TC

DR. KEITH WESCOURT  
PMC CORPORATION  
CENTRAL ENG. LABS.  
1185 COLEMAN AVE., BOX 580  
SANTA CLARA, CA 95052

DR. NORMAN M. WEINBERGER  
UNIV. OF CALIF.  
CTR. FOR THE NEUROBIOL.  
OF LEARNING & MEMORY  
IRVINE, CA 92717

DR. DOUGLAS WETZEL  
CODE 12  
NAVY PERS. R&D CTR.  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4800

DR. BARBARA WHITE  
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC.  
10 MOULTON ST.  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

DR. BARRY WHITSEL  
UNIV. OF NC  
DEPT. OF PHYSIOLOGY  
MEDICAL SCHOOL  
CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514

DR. CHRISTOPHER WICKENS  
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY  
UNIV. OF ILLINOIS  
CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820

DR. STEVEN ZORNETZLER  
ONR CODE 1140  
800 N. QUINCY ST.  
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. MICHAEL I. POSNER  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY  
EUGENE, OR 97403

CAPT. P. MICHAEL CURRAN  
ONR CODE 125  
800 N. QUINCY ST.  
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. MARSHALL J. FARR  
2520 NORTH VERNON ST.  
ARLINGTON, VA 22207

DR. JOEL DAVIS  
ONR CODE 1141NP  
800 NORTH QUINCY ST.  
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. HANS-WILLY SCHROIFF  
INST. FUER PSYCHOLOGIE  
DER RWTH AACHEN  
JAEGERSTRASS ZWISCHEN 17 U. 19  
5100 AACHEN, WEST GERMANY

DR. JAIME CARBONELL  
CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV.  
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15213

J. D. FLETCHER  
9931 CORSICA STREET  
VIENNA, VA 22180

DR. JOHN R. FREDERIKSEN  
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN  
50 MOULTON STREET  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

ERIC FACILITY ACQUISITIONS  
4033 RUGBY AVENUE  
BETHESDA, MD 20014

DR. BETH WARREN  
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC.  
50 MOULTON STREET  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138